

**Do you agree with the vision and development principles?
What would you change or add? Why?**

- Principles should be tightened – currently too vague/broad and open to interpretation.
- Biodiversity/sustainable development should come higher up the list (no.8 should be no. 1)
- Some of the principles could be merged eg. no. 4 and no. 10
- It was noted that the vision in the summary document was different from that in the SPD – reference to ‘greenprint’ omitted in summary document
- If SBC serious about creating a ‘greenprint’ for Swindon then wording needs to be strengthened to require security against flooding/climate change – green infrastructure must be future proofed – not just existing floodplain
- Green infrastructure to east of Borough boundary if possible should be included in Masterplan as providing flood attenuation
- Impact of development on flood risk elsewhere needs to be considered – particularly Nightingale Road end of South Marston
- Two brownfield sites in South Marston have been excluded from Masterplan – Crown Timber site and industrial estate on edge of village – if these areas were developed there would be less of a requirement for greenfield land
- Provision for faith communities needs to be included
- There should be a requirement for allotments / community farms to be integrated into development as houses tend to have small gardens

Do you agree with our proposed approach to transport? Have enough links to Swindon been identified? (See Section 6 of the document)

- The main links to Swindon were noted as being at White Hart, Commonhead and a new link at Dorcan
- The Group felt that there were not enough north / south links and there were no links to or from the EDA to the rural area. Public transport linking the EDA with the rural areas should be financially subsidised
- A420 to Oxford is already congested – traffic from the EDA would exacerbate the problem. Traffic ‘rat running’ north to Highworth should be stopped – road not appropriate for traffic
- The strategy does not promote walking or cycling – links across the A419/A420 are needed to encourage walking and cycling
- All roads go through green infrastructure – need green bridges as a minimum. There is no crossing at Acorn Bridge.
- All accesses should be available for pedestrians and cyclists

Do you agree that we should be trying to integrate the EDA with Swindon or do you think we should separate it out as a stand alone community?

- The Group felt that unless a functioning community was in place on day one, the EDA would never function as a separate community.
- Temporary facilities may be required until permanent ones are up and running
- There was a divergence of opinion over whether the EDA should be integrated with Swindon or a stand alone community – some felt that if infrastructure is in place then should be a stand alone community others felt that in the long term the EDA should be integrated into Swindon but capable of functioning on its own for day to day facilities. Higher order facilities would be available in Swindon.
- The Group noted that facilities in the EDA could provide for existing communities in the area.

How can we the EDA be delivered in a way that provides benefits for nearby communities in east Swindon and the villages?

- Villages are losing key facilities such as schools, shops and post offices. Provision of these facilities in the EDA should benefit the surrounding villages and adjacent communities in east Swindon
- The Group noted that new facilities in the EDA such as supermarkets could threaten the viability of smaller village shops – existing facilities therefore need to be protected. Smaller local neighbourhood facilities may be more appropriate.
- It was also noted that the EDA could support existing facilities in villages – smaller businesses could use village shops
- Crown Timber site could be used for small business start-ups provided the particular use was appropriate to the location
- Public transport links to surrounding villages and communities in east Swindon would be essential to ensuring these communities benefit from the EDA – possible need for financial subsidy

Do you agree with the social facilities we have identified? Is there any infrastructure that you think we have missed? (See Section 11 of the document)

- Provision for faith communities does not appear to be included in the list of facilities identified
- Future recreational requirements should be considered – not just about playing fields. Also need provision for skate parks, Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGA) etc
- It was suggested that local food cafés and farmers markets should be encouraged
- Need to encourage facilities to locate in the EDA and measures are required to ensure these facilities are retained
- Community facilities such as a low energy house to demonstrate a number of green measures in action (Eco-Build), interpretation centres and rangers stations to manage green infrastructure should also be considered
- In terms of school provision it was noted that South Marston School would require an extension to accommodate additional children – this would result in a loss of green space / playing fields. Alternatively people would drive to the new school provided as part of the EDA. This would potentially have an impact on the catchment areas for Stratton, Coleview and Grange Primary Schools
- Good links to Commonhead hospital. GP facilities are proposed as part of EDA – access to health facilities is an issue - need parking
- All sections of community need to be consulted re facilities e.g. youth services, local schools, colleges etc

Do you agree with proposed phasing, beginning development around White Hart and growing outwards? Have we missed anything on delivery? (See Page 86 of the document)

- Some members of the Group suggested that there should be four phases to the development rather than three – phase 2 should be split to allow the impact and infrastructure requirements of South Marston to be properly assessed
- It was noted that the links across the A420 may mean development would not be viable if phase two were split
- There is a danger that jobs would not be provided at the same time as housing if phase 2 was split – unless existing phase 2 was developed from the east to the west
- In order to achieve a sustainable community, EDA would need to be progressed from east to west otherwise development would always be dependent on Swindon
- Green framework needs to be an integral part of phase 1
- The Group questioned whether flooding issues were addressed in the phasing plan
- It was also questioned whether phase 3 was too big
- It was suggested that a Community Trust be set up to manage the social facilities and green infrastructure to encourage ownership – potential for facilities to be managed by Trust in collaboration with Swindon Borough Council / Parish Council if necessary

Are we doing enough to address climate change, the environment and ecology in the EDA? Is there anything else you think we should be doing? (See Sections 8 and 14 of the document)

- Green Infrastructure needs to be improved – SPD needs to be consistent with the Masterplan – currently muddled
- The green infrastructure should not be limited to the floodplain – it should be promoted through the whole development. Development should be led by green infrastructure - not the other way around.
- Strategic nature conservation areas outside the EDA are not mentioned in the SPD – Masterplan should include links to these sites. A co-operative / collaborative approach is needed with Vale of White Horse District Council
- Implications of building on or modifying the floodplain needs further consideration
- SPD should include a reference to a the need for development to be served by a sustainable energy source (this should not be specific to allow flexibility)
- Sustainable construction – SPD should be more specific and less aspirational. It should apply to commercial development as well as residential. It was noted that the Core Strategy would set the standards – contributions to carbon-offset fund if standards not met on site.
- Green roofs, tree planting (services should be located in one trench to allow for tree planting) and impacts of climate change (flooding) need to be considered.

Do you think the proposals are affordable and deliverable? In particular, off-site infrastructure requirements (See Section 16 of the document).

- Current economic climate means development is uncertain as demonstrated by halt at Wichelstowe
- It was noted that proposals for off-site mitigation at Wichelstowe was originally £3million but by the time the legal agreement was signed, this was reduced to £750,000
- Infrastructure model needs to be looked at again
- The Group felt that it was important to avoid a situation where requirements are prioritised – green infrastructure may come lower down the list
- Priorities list should closely reflect the key principles such as green infrastructure, improvements at White Hart etc. The minimum requirements should be made more explicit
- Given the location in the floodplain the development must be flood proofed
- Infrastructure requirements need to be future proofed to make sure funding is available
- The development needs to be future proofed in respect of climate change – suggested that proposals for tree planting should reflect change in climate e.g. planting of olive trees